

□ 1131

Messrs. HOLT, GEORGE MILLER of California, and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 22, I was detained in committee. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 22, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

Stated against:

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 22 on H.R. 54, the button did not record my "no" vote as the gavel fell.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. WEINER. Mr. Speaker, I rise for a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman may inquire.

Mr. WEINER. Mr. Speaker, on the bill we're going to be considering shortly, the Presidential checkoff bill, there's a requirement under the rules that the amendments be printed in the RECORD. Is that RECORD available?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the printed RECORD is not yet available.

Mr. WEINER. Further inquiry, does the Speaker have any guidance for the House on when that RECORD might be available so we can read what we're going to be considering in a matter of minutes?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair does not currently have that information. Under the terms of House Resolution 54, any issue would become ripe when the amendment process begins.

Mr. WEINER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROSKAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 359.

#### ELIMINATING TAXPAYER FINANCING OF PRESIDENTIAL ELECTIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 54 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 359.

□ 1134

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole

House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 359) to reduce Federal spending and the deficit by terminating taxpayer financing of presidential election campaigns and party conventions, with Mr. LATOURETTE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

General debate shall not exceed 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means and the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on House Administration.

The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ROSKAM), the gentleman from Washington (Mr. McDERMOTT), the gentleman from California (Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN), and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BRADY) each will control 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ROSKAM).

Mr. ROSKAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, last night, the President in this very Chamber issued us an invitation. In that invitation, there were several opportunities, but two of them I would like to highlight. One is, he said this: He said he is willing to eliminate whatever we can honestly afford to do without. I take the President at face value that he's interested in doing that.

The thing that the President issued was an invitation where he said this: He said, in fact, the best thing we could do on taxes for all Americans is to simplify the Tax Code.

Well, the law of governing Presidential election campaign funds in the Presidential Primary Matching Payment Account is located in the Internal Revenue Code, which really inherently makes no sense.

And I think during the course of this debate, Mr. Chairman, we're going to lay out the argument as to why the President's first point can be greeted and agreed to, that first goal that this is simply something that we can do without.

Let me make a couple of quick points. I think it's important to recognize the irony of the Statement of Administration Policy that was published on January 25, and I'm reading in the third paragraph, he says—the administration, in criticism of this effort, says, "Its effect would be to expand the power of corporations and special interests in the Nation's elections to force many candidates into an endless cycle of fundraising at the expense of engagement with voters on the issues."

How can that be, Mr. Chairman? President Obama, when he was a candidate in 2000 for the United States Presidency, declined to participate in this fund, both in his primary and in his general election. And if President Obama has been able to rise above that, I think other Americans can rise above that.

Also, I would just like to bring your attention to that same argument, and that is, a "Dear colleague" that was sent criticizing this bill said basically the same thing: By creating a viable alternative to private fundraising, the public financing system was designed to level the electoral playing field and ensure that candidates remain accountable to voters, not special interests.

So does that mean, implicitly, Mr. Chairman, that candidates who didn't participate in the program are somehow not accountable to voters? I think President Obama would say he's really accountable to voters.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1140

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN).

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I thank my colleague.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this measure, which, along with the Supreme Court's radical decision in Citizens United, takes our Nation's campaign finance system in precisely the wrong direction: less transparency and less information for the voters.

Americans from across the political spectrum—Democrats, Republicans, Independents—want less special interest money in politics, not more. They want clean, transparent, and competitive elections; and campaigns where candidates—those of us in this room and Presidential candidates—rise and fall based on the quality of their ideas, the strength of their arguments, and their ability to attract support from the voters that they seek to represent.

What they don't want are campaigns decided by how much secret money flows into an election from secret outside groups. And they will no longer tolerate, I believe, those politicians turning around and saying to those citizens: You have no right to know who is paying for what in our political campaigns; you have no right to know who is paying for those TV advertisements you're watching.

Let's remember what we are talking about here. The current Presidential financing system that this bill would eliminate arose from public outrage in the post-Watergate period. Rather than Presidential candidates trafficking in secret slush funds, our Nation decided that our democracy would be better served by a system of public disclosure, contribution limits, and emphasis on smaller-dollar contributions matched by the Presidential financing fund.

The system is voluntary, one line on our Tax Code, not complicated; and while not perfect, for most of its 36 years in existence, it has served this Nation well. Candidates from across the political spectrum, from Ronald Reagan to Jesse Jackson, have voluntarily participated in the Presidential financing system.

As my colleague on the other side of the aisle mentioned there is no doubt